20c MARCH 5, 1951

New Republic

LABOR'S WAR WITH WILSON

By HARRY CONN

ENGLAND'S CHICAGO "TRIBUNE"

By RICHARD L. STROUT

DEMOCRACY AS A UNIVERSAL PURPOSE

By A. POWELL DAVIES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic *in the* CLASSROOM

For thirty-six years the *New Republic* has been used as a supplementary text in colleges and universities all over the United States.

Professors of Economics, History, Sociology and English have long recognized its value as a means of bringing the immediate present into the classroom.

In the *New Republic* the students meet mature minds that are neither cynical nor indifferent. They are brought face to face with ideas and problems that will shape their lives and to which they will make their own contributions. They come in contact with good writing and good reporting. They learn about significant books and writers, take part in discussions and controversies, and are kept abreast of proposals and plans for meeting the challenge of the future for which they are being prepared.

If you are a teacher will you please consider the *New Republic* for your classes this Fall Semester?

SPECIAL CLASSROOM RATES

Each student's copy costs 10¢ weekly (half the regular price) if ten or more are mailed to a single address. Free desk copies are included for each instructor. Orders may be placed for any number of weeks, even for one week only, if desired, or for the entire semester. Copies are mailed from Washington, D. C., on Tuesdays, two days before the *New Republic* appears on any newsstand. Students are assured of receiving the magazine while the news and topics are fresh and exciting.

Advance payment is not necessary. You need only fill out the order form provided below and send it to us. The bill will be sent later.

ORDER FORM

NEW REPUBLIC, 40 East 49 Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of the *New Republic* for ..... weeks beginning with the issue which will reach us about .....
@ 10¢ a copy (regularly 20¢). Payment will be made on receipt of your bill.

Name..... College or University.....

City..... Zone..... State..... 3/ 5/51

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR MARCH 5, 1951

5 The Big Four Bid for Germany, An Editorial
6 The New Wage Formula, An Editorial
6 The Week:
6 ADA Convention
6 Gray Versus Magnuson
7 Interest and the FRB
7 Subversion in Housing
8 Butter Going up
8 Taft's Men Work Hard
9 Talmadge and the Press
9 NAM Propaganda
10 Outside America
11 Democracy as a Universal Purpose, by A. Powell Davies
13 England's Chicago "Tribune," by Richard L. Strout
15 Labor Mobilizes, by Harry Conn
18 Harold L. Ickes
19 Books:
19 "Soviet Politics: The Dilemma of Power," reviewed by Ronald Thompson
20 "From Here to Eternity," reviewed by Louis Falstein
22 On the Air
22 Theatre

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller

ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling

REPORTER: Jean Begeman

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY ASSISTANTS: Marjorie Stanley, Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1951, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

As we see it, the chances of immediate war are receding. Stalin's *Pravda* interview may be the warning before the storm, but Truman wouldn't be going off to Florida for 23 days if he thought so. (Truman needs the change; may it do him good.) The State Department thinks that Stalin was trying to reassure Mao in China. Truman's own view came extemporaneously in a talk to the Masonic Grand Masters here last week: "We are gradually approaching a position in the world where a third world war can be prevented."

Let's list some of the factors: Militarily the situation in Korea is so much better as to be transformed. Diplomatically the Grand Alliance has gotten through the squabble over the 38th Parallel and for almost the first time really means something. The US air power has doubled since Korea, and over-all defense production is accelerating. Military programs in Western Europe are picking up. The Senate troops-for-Europe debate shows there is only a "toe-hold of isolation" left in Congress, to use Dewey's phrase. Defection of Italian top Communist leaders underlines the previous story of reduced Soviet momentum in Europe and contracting political influence, big though it still is. Finally, Charlie Wilson's engineers are preparing for eye-popping production feats; if we can only hold on to our seats until 1953, many of the proposed restrictions can be relaxed, and the problem may well be to know what to do with the goods we are producing.

Does this leave us encouraged? Yes, in a way, because war is the final calamity. The trouble is that revolutions never stop at their immediate objective. For example, the continuation of inflation here could provide a channel of reckless bitterness that would be a demagogue's delight. It was "bushel-basket" inflation that produced Hitler. Already US inflation has halved middle-class stored savings in insurance, bonds, savings accounts and pensions. It is still booming ahead. Unless checked it will provide just the kind of poisoned economic atmosphere in which McCarthyism operates best. We have produced in McCarthy a really dangerous man—a man who has demonstrated on the national scene brilliant facility in the Hitler "big lie" technique. Now McCarthy and Taft are in alliance. Whether Taft is using McCarthy (as he thinks) or the other way around remains to be seen.

Another big headache is the complacency and and condescension of American Industry to organized labor. This is so traditional and prevalent as to be almost unconscious. It is fostered by nine-tenths of the press. In Europe, labor has a seat at the table of management, but not in the US. Yet the feature of America's social history is the gradual rise of workers in relation to capital. The US trade unions are the real counter-revolutionary force to Communism, not the employers. When Truman set up his new production supergovernment under Wilson, he handed the whole thing over to management. Bankers and industrialists took charge. There was even talk of labor conscription: Senator Schoeppel (R, Kans.) suggested the need of "drafting defense workers." Not to give labor strong or equal voice with management in these plans, as FDR did, was extraordinarily naive. The explosion by the joint labor group was inevitable. A new round of press attacks on "unpatriotic" labor such as occurred in World War II now seems likely. The aggrieved railway men have gone back to work, dismayed at not winning a 40-hour week and with Truman's epithet of "Russians" deeply rankling. The Administration will be well advised to clear up this situation quickly if it can.

The St. Louis *Post Dispatch* devoted

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the full front page of its Sunday editorial section of February 18 to "The Sinister Alliance Between McCarthy and Taft" with a cartoon by Fitzpatrick and three corrosive articles on McCarthyism to date. It was as savage and effective an editorial attack as we have seen in a decade. A Senate subcommittee is now gingerly uncovering the "big lie" technique by which conservative Senator Tydings was defeated in Maryland on the ground that he was "friendly" to Communism. McCarthy master-minded Republican Butler's successful campaign which included faked photographs prepared by Colonel McCormick's Washington *Times-Herald* purportedly showing Tydings chatting with Earl Browder, plus almost daily attacks by Fulton Lewis Jr. and Hearst. Every Congressman in Washington knows that if this smear was made to stick against Tydings, it can be made to stick against him—or that he may use it against someone else.

Naturally, Democrats are gleeful over the Republican internal row on the troops-for-Europe issue. There is reason to believe Democrats are prolonging the discussion to emphasize GOP disunity. Actually it is questionable whether Republicans outside Congress are as divided as those within. Isolationism is waning fast. It all goes back to Taft. His grip on the official Republican organization is now really quite remarkable. Unrestrained by Vandenberg, he is trying to take foreign-affairs leadership in his party. His leadership on domestic issues is unquestioned. The appearance of Dewey before hostile GOP Senators last week confirmed our belief that, as President, he would have had trouble with his own party. He would have battled Congress, probably, just the same as every other President.

Notes: Russia is spending three times as much on jamming the Voice of America as Congress spends on the "Voice." . . . Before freshman Senator Duff (R, Pa.) started his speaking tour advocating troops for Europe, he talked with Vandenberg and Eisenhower; Duff and Dewey, controlling GOP delegates from the two largest states, now favor Ike for President. . . .

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

Disagreement with Purcell

SIR: I wish to express complete disagreement with the ideas put forward by Victor Purcell in your issue of February 5. It seems to me that he bases his case on errors of fact and opinion and on a very one-sided view of the Korean crisis.

In the first place, he overlooks the unwillingess of Mao, as well as Chiang, to agree to Marshall's terms.

In the second place, he blithely states that after Marshall's trip "the USA thus intervened in Chinese internal affairs."

In the third place, he seems to state that Communists were the only force in China that was fighting the Japanese, a ridiculous denial of the brave fight that the Kuomintang Government carried on for years against the Japanese, and equal to the similar charge that Communists did no fighting against the invaders.

In the fourth place, he overlooks the UN order to proceed against the North Koreans completely.

And in the fifth place, I stoutly deny that the Chinese aggression was "morally and practically ideal."

If, of course, you presume that Formosa is an integral part of China (not that I deny China's legal and historic rights), then I suppose it is just one more step to claim Korea as a Chinese province. But otherwise the concerted Red attacks of November and December, going far beyond a defense of a narrow buffer, are not justifiable. This move has been compared to a US move into Mexico; how many of these apologists would applaud a sweeping offensive on behalf of an American puppet in Northern Mexico?

There is no denying that an Asian spirit is abroad. But its nature may not be just as Mr. Purcell presumes. When he classes the Government of Burma as "middle-class," I am led to wonder whether he deems only those who have received the word of Marx from the Kremlin capable of truly representing the majority of Asians? The majority of Americans are not inculcated with a feeling of military superiority over the Chinese (most Americans have little knowledge of the Opium Wars, etc.), they are desirous that the people of Asia progress in a democratic fashion, and they do not believe that Communism offers that progress, or probably any other variety. Therefore I believe that Mr. Purcell is not only not "largely right," but tragically wrong in his evaluation of recent events in the Orient.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. JOSEPH LOSOS

The People Want Peace

SIR: Is there an atom of truth in T.R.B.'s denial (*NR*, February 5) that America is hopelessly divided? Yes, just one: if Americans are presented no alternatives by their leaders, they will go to murder and die in Korea, hating it to the very last. . . . So long as any hope exists, and any alternative is offered, Americans *are* terrifically divided between "preventive war," "peace through strength" and "peace through diplomacy" groups. And the *NR* is either blind or deliberately dishonest to deny the strength of the third group. . . .

It is not narrow chauvinists who want an end to the slaughter and starvation of millions of Koreans, who deplore the Rhees and the Chiangs, who want no atomization of the millions in Asia's metropolises. Your self-deception surpasses belief. It obviously has relieved you of the simple journalistic necessity of checking with "grass-roots sentiment. . . ."

The ultimate irony is that you do not even know your own hearts. On your staff, I am glad to say, are many who fought courageously and sincerely in World War II. Your editorials imply that the same crucial issues, the same purpose and validity, underlie the present conflict. . . . Presumably then, world war III would be fought by you with the same zeal and conviction. Do you honestly believe this? Can you in good conscience predict that, *in the reality of the combat situation*, you would not agree that this is "the wickedest of all wars?" the *NR* should wake up to the facts and wake up to itself.

Chicago PAUL BARTON JOHNSON

[Apparently we haven't made our position clear. We favor strength as an aid to diplomacy, not an alternative. We do not think that surrender in Korea will bring an end to starvation and misgovernment for Koreans or peace for Asia. Our present objective is to help prevent, not win, world war III. – THE EDITORS]

For Kenneth Patchen

SIR: Kenneth Patchen, distinguished American poet, is gravely ill. To help make possible the expensive medical treatment he requires, an evening of poetry readings will be held in New York City on March 10 at the Community Church, 40 East Thirty-fifth Street. Among those participating will be Dr. Edith Sitwell, Sir Osbert Sitwell, William Carlos Williams, W. H. Auden, E. E. Cummings and Archibald MacLeish. Tickets may be obtained at the door, or in advance from the Community Church or the Gotham Book Mart, 41 West Forty-seventh Street.

WINIFRED HARPER BONNELL

New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 124, NUMBER 10. ISSUE 1892, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 5, 1951

New Republic

THE BIG FOUR BID FOR GERMANY

PROSPECTS that the anticipated Foreign Ministers' Conference will achieve any major compromises have dimmed with each new note transmitted between Moscow and the Western capitals. Both sides are far too much committed to fundamental policies to yield ground for an agreement weighty enough to lower the war temperature. The character which Big Four conferences have assumed was succinctly described by Secretary Acheson in 1949 as "like the indicator on the steam boiler. They indicate the pressure which has been built up. They indicate the various gains or losses in position which have taken place between the meetings. . . ."

To the Russians the dominant international development not in their favor is the growing strength of the West German Government and its impending participation in an anti-Soviet military force. Therefore they are eager to talk about Germany and perhaps even to make concessions in that area. The West is primarily concerned with Soviet and satellite threats to Yugoslavia, Iran and Austria—not to speak of Korea—and is demanding that the agenda bear directly or indirectly on these areas. The Western notes to this effect have by no means been any more conciliatory than the Soviet, although they have been more consistent than the Russians' mixture of sweet words and heavy-handed accusations. But negotiations are still proceeding, and it appears that the Russians are so anticipant of weaning German support for a "unified Germany" and creating further European dissension against the "armament race" at least to allow the other problems put on the agenda.

In Germany itself the propaganda battle has been raging for months, although the major powers have for the most part kept out of it. East Germany's Premier Otto Grotewohl took the initiative by proposing unification of the zones based on "equality." Soviet Zone city councils have passed innumerable "unification" resolutions, and thousands of East Germans have been writing friends in the Western Zones extolling this alluring idea. Handicapped by the fact that the Western definition of "democracy" does not permit the open management of political puppets, the West has been put on the defensive on this crucial question.

A striking lack of mobility has also characterized the State Department's handling of German rearmament. Despite overwhelming German opposition to participation in Western defense at this time, Acheson has repeatedly emphasized that our policy has not changed. His critics point out that German rearmament plans without German support will not give the West a particularly strong hand at the Conference and would constitute an issue inviting successful Soviet exploitation. Reasoning that a retreat on rearmament will be thought weakness, some say, "What else can we do?"

The answer implies a reorientation of strategy. Our negotiators must recognize that the West's outstanding achievement in Germany is political, not military. Despite obstacles and obvious exceptions, the mass of West Germans have developed a surprising understanding of democratic liberties. While some of their leaders have engaged in opportunist tactics akin to those pursued in countries with older democratic traditions, the great majority of West Germans appear willing to take their stand with the West's ideals. In sharp contrast, the East Zone Germans are kept in line only by fear, party rewards and a puppet Soviet apparatus. Thousands of them are leaving all their possessions behind to escape to the Western Zones.

Although it may call for a political fusion of the zones to give its "liberation" agitators bigger audiences, what the Kremlin really fears is German national unity. Therefore the West can counter not only with demands for demilitarization of the East European satellites, but with an affirmative unification policy of its own based on the abolition of East Zone police and puppet apparatus. To the Soviets this would mean a direct threat to the political security of their empire's central European provinces.

But to the Germans the identification of their yearning for a united country with the principles of Western democracy will stimulate the kind of restrained nationalism which the West is seeking to create. Their willingness to participate in a defensive alliance against Soviet totalitarianism would then become almost axiomatic. It is toward such a German integration with both Western ideals and power that our diplomats must aim while warming themselves around the "steam-boiler" at the conference table.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW WAGE FORMULA

THE NEW wage formula issued by Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston will not settle labor's grievances against administration of the defense-mobilization program. If the official wage order takes the form anticipated as this is written, labor will probably admit that the arrangement is livable. Johnston is expected to stick by the 10 percent ceiling on increases in wages over the level of January 15, 1950, as recommended by the industry and public members of the Wage Stabilization Board, instead of granting the 12 percent allowance advocated by the labor representatives before they walked out of the WSB. If the new formula validates the escalator clauses in existing labor contracts, providing cost-of-living and productivity increases, and excludes fringe benefits from the 10 percent allowance, however, it will represent a considerable concession to labor's wage demands. Provision for special handling of existing inequities and of substandard wage cases would remain to be secured, but both the new Defense Mobilizer Charles Wilson and Johnston have also privately indicated their willingness to consider special treatment for these categories.

Even a full concession to labor's demands on a wage formula would not guarantee immediate return of the labor members to the WSB or win unqualified labor support for the mobilization program. The promises, which Wilson gave in his radio address last week, of a better deal for working men and more respect for their point of view as expressed through national union leaders, were vague and general. Labor has adopted a "show me" attitude toward Wilson and all such assurances made by him.

The United Labor Policy Committee is likely to wait before returning to the WSB until there is real evidence that big business is not going to be allowed to run things its own way in Wilson's organization and that the Administration means business about going after the powers its needs from Congress really to control the cost of living. In insisting on action in place of promises on matters so basic to the general welfare, labor's spokesmen are acting in the interest of all of us.

THE WEEK

ADA CONVENTION

CLEVELAND, OHIO (NR corresp.)

The 550 delegates to the Fourth Annual Convention of Americans for Democratic Action, held here over the long Washington's birthday weekend, were surprised to find themselves in agreement, bordering unanimity, on the major crucial questions facing American liberals.

A nine-page resolution on foreign policy was passed overwhelmingly without a single major amendment from the floor. The primary theme was to block Communism and keep the peace by a stronger US, a stronger UN and extended economic aid to the peoples of Europe and Asia. As to China, the ADA backed the UN action to resist Communist aggression in Korea; warned that it would be "folly to be guided by the expectation that we can lure Peking away from Moscow"; favored withholding recognition of Red China and admission to the UN so long as Peking defies the principles of the UN; sought to limit the areas of hostilities in Asia; proposed to aid Chiang Kai-shek only to the extent necessary to permit him to hold Formosa against Communist aggression; and urged rapid and extended aid in all forms to non-Communist Asia.

The ADA expressed concern that national defense-mobilization policy "reflects the philosophy of big business." It proposed "amendment of the Defense Production Act to permit effective control of prices at the consumer level to correspond with the wage control authorized by the Act," and further urged the participation of agricultural, labor and business representatives at all levels of the mobilization program.

The political policy resolution restated the ADA's "independence of all political parties." For the first time, the goal of party "realignment" was proposed as official policy. The raising of this question reflects the growing concern of ADAers with practical political matters and their mounting desire for a major political party of consistent liberalism. Since this problem had not been debated by the chapters, it was postponed until the next convention.

Organizationally, the reports were hopeful. The treasury last year enjoyed its best health since the organization's founding. Probably the ADA's greatest asset—and the reason for the high measure of agreement at this convention—is the *esprit de corps* and common point of view developed in four years of collective debate and action.

GRAY VS. MAGNUSON

The Association of American Medical Colleges has charged that the forced resignation of Dr. Paul B. Magnuson as medical director of the Veterans

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Administration "caused all medical schools . . . to be gravely concerned." In a hearing before the Senate Labor Subcommittee, the Association said the dispute over the control of the medical care system, which reached a climax when Magnuson was ousted on January 14, threatens "the continued existence of the present excellent medical program."

The big fight in the VA between Administrator Carl R. Gray Jr. and Dr. Magnuson is a matter of basic policy: whether or not the medical director should have general administrative supervision not only over professional medical services, but also over such supplemental jobs as hospital management. Dr. Magnuson believes that medical care cannot be separated from all the other facilities which make up the full treatment of patients. The AAMC agrees: "Everything from the heating of a hospital to recreation for patients affects medical care."

INTEREST AND THE FRB

Liberal economists and hard-headed bankers have for months been pursuing a relentless assault on the Administration's debt-management policy. Led by the Federal Reserve Board, which is seeking to regain the credit-regulating powers it largely lost during the last war, critics of Treasury Secretary John Snyder have charged that his policy of controlling the rate of interest at a low 2.5 percent has been a prime factor in the present monetary inflation.

The cause of the furor is the alarming $10 billion rise in bank loans last year, amounting to a 20 percent increase in outstanding credit. The FRB argues that, if it were to stop supporting Government bonds, banks would hold on to their present holdings, reduce their loans and charge higher interest rates, which would dissuade many potential borrowers. The big question begged by this argument is whether credit demand is the cause or the effect of the inflationary spiral. The answer is hotly debated, but the more persuasive argument seems to be that the post-Korea fear of material shortages and a declining dollar caused a buying spree which forced greater credit for such purposes as a $10 billion increase in business inventories.

Economists' arguments for the FRB proposal are based on the widely-accepted theoretical principle that the interest rate is a vital determinant of credit demand. But case studies do not bear out that theory. As reported in a recent issue of *Survey of Current Business,* interviews with over 300 manufacturers on what caused them to invest disclosed that a bare half dozen even mentioned the cost of equity capital. The big reason businessmen gave for seeking bank loans was the state of public demand, which sky-rocketed after Korea but is now definitely petering out.

Present indications are that the huge outstanding private credit will deflate rapidly. The decline in profitable mortgage opportunities again forced savings banks and insurance companies to make heavy Government bond purchases in January, causing the FRB quietly to announce that for the first month in over a year it has not had to buy up any surplus Government securities. In addition, manufacturers in many industries find themselves overstocked, and are now liquidating both their inventories and their bank loans at a rapid rate. Unless this trend is reversed, the lack of other loan demand will force the banks to resume buying Uncle Sam's 2.5 percent bonds.

While credit inflation may now be halted, it may go spiralling again, depending on the success of the total economic stabilization program. The core of the problem lies in *directly* controlling the volume of credit, rather than in trying expensive experiments with the interest rate. The FRB, which is as much the Government spokesman for the big bankers as the Labor Department is for the unions, has refused to consider direct controls. Its spokesmen have, in effect, been calling for complete control over the country's four million businesses, while asserting that control of 14,000 banks was unworkable. In this they have been backed to the hilt by the big New York banks, although many small bankers have vigorously supported the Administration.

The FRB, while trying to encourage a free-rolling money market in a controlled economy, has not even raised its reserve rates to their statutory limits. If it really wants to get back into the business of controlling credit, it must utilize new tools—since the tremendous size of the Government debt makes the Treasury policy, of necessity, a dominant and not a variable factor. The FRB can do much to maintain the country's stability by recognizing the need for direct controls over the banks and seeking whatever additional authority it may need to do so.

SUBVERSION IN HOUSING

Some 15 state legislatures are now, or will be shortly, considering anti-housing measures ranging from bills requiring public hearings on every proposed project to ones requiring a county-wide poll on each site selected in any part of the county. The National Housing Conference, Inc., an independent organization for better housing, warns that the big real estate and landlord lobbies are moving in on the legislatures to undercut local housing plans and, indirectly, subvert federal housing.

"The real-estate lobby's victories in local referenda gave it the taste of blood," says Lee Johnson of the NHC. "Last November's triumph with the California anti-housing initiative made it dizzy with success. Moving through state legislatures, it hopes to knock whole states at a time out of the public-housing picture."

The anti-housing lobby's strategy is to tie up local housing programs with requirements for special elections and referenda. For example, the Pennsylvania State Senate has a bill before it that requires an election to permit a local housing authority to acquire real estate and is even putting site selection up to a popular vote. In Washington State, the legislature is considering a bill requiring a majority popular vote for a local housing authority to proceed with any project subsidized directly or indirectly. In Texas, a Senate bill introduced February 13 would require a referendum for a state public body to enter into a co-operation agreement. Only qualified electors *who own taxable property* in the locality would be eligible to vote on the proposition.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The theory of a referendum seems good at first: let the people hear both sides and make up their own minds. However, it doesn't work that way. Professor Winston W. Crouch studied the referendum in California and concluded: "In most instances, the old adage of politics that 'the side that spends the most wins' has been proved true." The anti-housing lobby spent an estimated $1.2 million in advertising to influence the vote in the California housing election. Obviously, the ordinary people who would benefit from public housing don't have that kind of cash to publicize their side of the argument.

BUTTER GOING UP

CHICAGO (NR corresp.)

Within a few weeks in December, private buyers snapped up the Government's huge store of butter—125 million pounds—at the bargain price of 63 cents a pound. No sooner was the Government's larder bare than the price of butter began to rise. Within 10 days after the Government halted, the wholesale price hit 71 cents a pound. Those who had purchased butter at 63 cents a pound stood to make a pretty profit if they sold at the market. If they decided to hold on to their bargain, the chances were they would do even better.

Although butter prices have since dropped slightly, there is an excellent chance that later this year they will soar. Informed trade sources freely predict that when butter prices rise to parity, the ceiling prices which then will come into effect will have to be adjusted to permit the retail price to go to about one dollar a pound and milk to about 30 cents a quart. Unless this is done, it is argued, the country will have very little butter for its bread. It would be more profitable for farmers to sell their cattle for high-paying beef than to keep them in dairy herds.

It looks as though smart butter buyers have cleaned up. The Government certainly is cleaned out. A few faint murmurings have been heard implying that the consumer may have been cleaned.

At the same time the Government's butter was melting away, sales and gifts were wiping out 138 million pounds of cheese and 676 million pounds of dried milk from the Government's store.

Operation Dairy Products was one of the most remarkable in the history of Government price supporting. It began with the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949, which required the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of butter at a level that worked out at 60 cents a pound. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, therefore, had to buy all the butter necessary to keep the price from sliding below 60 cents. As it turned out this meant practically all the butter which the country did not immediately consume, most of what normally goes into storage. The dairy industry usually does its own storing. Prices are higher in the winter, and it pays. But in 1949 and 1950 the Government was paying the market price and was being saddled with the storage charges and risk. The trade shrugged: "The CCC [Commodity Credit Corporation, the Department's purchasing branch] can have it."

In 1949 and 1950 only a scattering few million pounds of these huge holdings were sold commercially. Substantial quantities were given away to welfare agencies at home and abroad or were sold on practically a give-away basis to the school-lunch program and foreign governments. Even so, Government cold storage warehouses bulged with butter, cheese and milk. Storage and insurance charges ran up into the millions. Suddenly in late November, this whole situation changed. Butter production dropped more than seasonally. At the same time, incomes rose, and people began to eat more butter. It appeared likely they would want still more. In one week 12 million pounds were sold; in the next, 15 million, and in the two following weeks, 25 million pounds each. Butter was going with such bargain-counter fury the Government could scarcely keep track. Sales were halted on December 22 for a check-up. It was found that only 5 million pounds remained out of the 130 million pounds the Government held on November 27. The last 5-million-pound chunk was sold on a competitive-bid basis in January for an average of 65 cents a pound.

If the donations are discounted, the Department of Agriculture came out surprisingly well. The butter sold to the trade was disposed of at the 60 cents it had cost, plus 3 cents for handling and storage. On the other hand, critics have pointed out that at the very time the Department was selling butter for 63 cents, the Quartermaster Corps was buying about 20 million pounds at the full market price and is continuing to buy about 4 million pounds a month.

The passing of the Government butter also removed the last best insurance against price rises. Proof that the Government stocks were a deterrent is shown by the fact that the price of butter did not shoot up until the Government stocks were gone. Butter still is only at about 90 percent of parity as compared to 140 percent for meat. But now that the restraining effect of the Government holdings is gone, if the price pressure should be as strong as the trade predicts, the Government may have to resort to subsidies for the country to get butter at less than one dollar a pound.

TAFT'S MEN WORK HARD

The theory that conservatives are politically more active than liberals—the reason Democrats have to work harder in "get-out-the-vote" appeals before elections—was given scientific sanction in a recent study by Elmo Roper published in the current *American Political Science Review*. Using statistical methods of social research, Roper found that "politically active" people—those who belong to semi-political organizations, write to their Congressmen, attend political meetings or work for candidates—tend to think along Robert Taft's lines, while the chronically apathetic are more in agreement with President Truman's position.

In response to questions on their feelings about the President, 48 percent among the "politically very active" used "only unfavorable words," while 35 percent used "only favorable words." But the proportion of those who favor Truman's position was much

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

higher among those who don't do much to put their feelings into political practice. Of the "politically very inactive," no less than 55 percent used "only favorable words" about the President, while only 16 percent used "only unfavorable words," the remainder having mixed feelings or none at all.

Similarly, when asked which Senators' actions they most approve, 44 percent of the "very active" named Republicans or Southern Democrats, with 19 percent voting for Taft. But among the "very inactive," 84 percent could not name any Senator at all. Taft ranked first in popularity among the "inactives" because so few of those questioned were acquainted with liberal candidates that the two percent who favored Taft were the largest single group. When asked which Senators they disapproved of, 10 percent of the "very active" named Taft—only half as many as approved of him in this group—while Democratic liberals Pepper (Fla.), Humphrey (Minn.) and Taylor (Idaho) bore the remaining brunt of the disapproval.

TALMADGE AND THE PRESS

Georgia's Gov. Herman Talmadge recently learned that tampering with the press is asking for trouble. In the closing days of the state legislature's 1951 term, Talmadge tried to slip through three bills designed to gag the major newspapers in Georgia—the Atlanta *Constitution* and *Journal*. Fortunately, the legislators, who for the most part agree with Talmadge's backwoods point of view on many issues, could not stomach his attempt to impose outright censorship on the press.

The *Constitution and Journal*, both owned by former Gov. James M. Cox of Ohio, have been sharply critical of the Talmadges—of Old Gene before his death and of Young Herman, his son and successor. Two of the bills, which passed the Senate by a bare majority, were aimed at breaking up the joint ownership and permitting newspapers to be sued for libel in any county where they have a circulation of more than 50. A third bill declared that the business of publishing newspapers and magazines is "clothed with a public interest and subject to regulation by the state."

Talmadge had cleverly worded the libel bill so that it would affect only newspapers in the larger cities and so that libel suits would be brought before rural juries, where Talmadge has always had such blind support that virtually anything said against him would be considered libelous.

Fortunately, the House pigeonholed all three measures last week. The Washington *Post*, in an editorial congratulating the Georgia House for seeing through the speciousness of these proposals, editorialized: "In view of its Governor's ambitions and demagogic methods, the state has peculiar need for independent newspapers."

NAM PROPAGANDA

The House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, now defunct, might add as a footnote to the facts it uncovered an article published in the last issue of the *NAM News*, house organ of the National Association of Manufacturers. The article begins:

> If all NAM-produced pamphlets ordered for distribution to employees, students and community leaders in 1950 had been stacked one on top of the other, they would have reached nearly four miles into the sky—the height of 16 Empire State Buildings.
>
> If laid end to end, they would have stretched from Washington, D. C., to Omaha, Nebraska—or from Philadelphia to Kansas City. . . .
>
> NAM's record-pamphlet distribution in 1950 — 7,839,039 copies — makes the Association one of the larger distributors of pamphlets in the country.

Since the Literature Department of the NAM was organized four years ago, the survey showed, 18,640,270 pamphlets have been produced and distributed: 41 percent to employees, 53 percent to high-school and college students and six percent to community leaders, including ministers and women's club officials, throughout the entire country.

The greatest increase in circulation last year was to employees. Manufacturers ordered 46 percent more pamphlets for distribution to their workers than in the previous year and found that the most popular propaganda weapon "to reach masses of people in both the employee and student markets with broad messages" was the full-color "comic-type" booklet.

Over four million NAM publications were circulated among high-school and college students in 1950—an increase of 11 percent over 1949 and nearly 600 percent higher than 1947. "Indicative of the growing interest among high schools and colleges was the fact that the percentage of return on the mailings climbed 55 percent over 1949," the NAM reveals! "More than 16,000 educators ordered material for their students."

These are handy statistics to have around when Congressmen and businessmen complain about labor's political action and educational programs which, by comparison, only scratch the surface in the propaganda field.

HERBLOCK IN THE WASHINGTON POST

"But first a few words from our sponsors—"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUTSIDE AMERICA

THE ATLANTIC GETS WIDER

The Soviet Government strongly supported the choice of an American city as headquarters of the United Nations. Some Americans still hoped for one world but Stalin, whose thinking was not unlike that of Pope Alexander VI, wanted no more than two. Opposition to the development of any form of Western European bloc was at the time a major element in his policy. Moscow would have no European city as the site of the UN, for fear environmental conditioning might stimulate a political power other than her own on the European continent. Asia was still a vast hinterland, a Russian city was out of the question, so an American one seemed just right. Until recently, Stalin may often have regretted that early judgment: environmental conditioning has played a part in the development of the Atlantic Community, certainly a worse threat to the Sovietization of Western Europe than any bloc could have been.

But now there are Western European partisans of the Atlantic Community who are beginning to feel that Moscow's present effort to split Western unity, especially to drive wedges between the public opinions of America and Western Europe, is being helped by the presence of the United Nations headquarters in New York. Their opinion, spelled out for example in a relatively dispassionate article in the London *New Statesman*, is that the environment of such debates as the one on policy toward Mao's China tends to help Washington's pleading and to hurt a fair and equal presentation of London's and New Delhi's case. A result, as damaging to Western unity as it is pleasing to Moscow's divisive operators, is that American public opinion gets the impression that honest disagreement on the part of British opinion involves a kind of treason to the common cause.

Whereas the major task of mutual understanding was, before Korea, to get Americans to understand European attitudes, a number of the best European journalists stationed in the United States now believe the big job is to get Europeans to understand the reasons for the hardening of American attitudes. Such journalists include Maurice Ferro of the *Monde* of Paris, Ugo Stille of the *Corriere della Sera* of Milan, and Sebastian Haffner of the *Observer* of London. Haffner writes:

> We [the British] have always felt a mild skepticism about the United Nations, and hearing the Americans using solemn language about the Charter, world law, and aggression, some of us are inclined to believe that this is just cant, a way of clothing ordinary power-politics in fine words. With a few Americans it may be so, but with the vast majority it is not. . . . The United Nations is an American invention and an American system—one might almost say *the* American system—of international relations. . . . If American belief in the United Nations were definitely broken, the consequences would be unpredictable.

Yet spokesmen for French public opinion, the vigorously anti-Communist leftist newspaper *Franc-Tireur* of Paris for example, believe that the American Government is using the methods of power-politics to defend its supremacy, or the supremacy of its goal, in the United Nations. They believe that while Moscow is trying to split Washington away from London and Paris, Washington is trying to wage a counter-offensive of modified divisiveness by getting Paris to line up with it against London on Asiatic policy, and London with it against Paris on European policy.

In terms of official policy, the counter-offensive may work. But it remains true that the gap between American and European public opinions will not have been bridged, for the war in Indo-China remains extremely unpopular to most Frenchmen, and the rearmament of Germany is equally unpopular to most Britons.

The primary difficulty is a difference in experience, which prevents the British and French peoples from making the historical analogies that seem to be invoked in America as the justification for the uncompromising toughness of American opinion. "The true motive force of American opinion at this moment," says Haffner, "is a fusion of nationalist, ideological and moral reasons and emotions." This fusion stems from the feeling that the Mao situation in Korea is a parallel of the Manchurian situation of 1931; that the problem of sanctions repeats the Hoare-Laval temptation in Abyssinia in 1935; and that compromise now means a repetition of the Munich appeasement in 1938.

European public opinion rejects all these analogies as dangerous half-truths. If the "free Asia," which according to General MacArthur is the stake in Korea, includes an Indo-China won from Ho Chi-minh by Gen. de Lattre de Tassigny on behalf of Bao Dai, the French people believe that no veneer of moral crusading can quite hide the fact of colonialist imperialism. And the British who know that Europe's role in China has been almost exclusively aggressive share the disgust of the French Left over the American insistence that the Mao Chinese be branded devils.

The Tokyo correspondent of the *Observer* says:

> As elsewhere in non-Communist Asia, there is considerable support in Japan for the belief that the spread of Communism throughout Asia—with the possible exception of India—cannot be stopped, even by world war.

Perhaps that is an exaggeration, or at least a misreading of the facts. But at the very moment when Pleven was bowing deeply in agreement before President Truman in Washington, the French press was wondering whether American moral condemnation of Mao at the UN plus jellied-gasoline bombs in Korea would be any more effective as an anti-Soviet combination in China than they have been as a pro-American combination in Europe. And the British attitude toward neo-MacArthurism was simply that they'd had it.

Paris PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMOCRACY AS A UNIVERSAL PURPOSE

by A. Powell Davies

IDEAS NEVER stand still. Either they grow in influence or waste away. As Justice Holmes once put it, "Every idea is an incitement; it offers itself for belief and if believed it is acted upon, unless some other belief outweighs it or some failure of energy stifles the movement at its birth."

That is what the idea of liberty has been: an incitement to be free. Not only Europe and the Americans but the entire world has felt the force of this incitement. The same is true of the idea of equality which, in spite of the difficulty of defining it, has inspired millions of both the East and West with the hope of equal opportunity. Taken together, these two ideas encourage still a third one, *democracy*, which means not only that government should be *of, by and for* the people, but that every individual is of infinite worth and that, co-operating together, free individuals can form societies unlimited in possibility. Authoritarian societies not only impose political and economic servitude; they fetter the mind and bar the gateways of the future. It was democracy, first as a vision in Judea, then as an experiment in Athens, that liberated men from the false belief that the gods had doomed them to be powerless in the face of circumstance and incapable of being governed by any other rule than tyranny.

In the Western nations, with a culture stemming from Judea and Athens, the democratic idea became a definite belief in the eighteenth century. It produced the American and French Revolutions and brought immense reforms to other countries. Then it began to lose velocity. It applied itself too slowly and too weakly to economic conditions. It took too long to put an end to slavery. It failed to establish racial equality. It permitted imperialism. It was feeble in resisting exploitation of retarded peoples. Its principle that "all men are created equal" was not fully worked out, and the doctrine of "the survival of the fittest" largely supplanted it. As an "incitement," it suffered "a failure of energy" in the West precisely when it was inducing a revolutionary ferment in the East. It was not accepted as a universal faith and purpose. It, therefore, became possible for "some other belief" to "outweigh it"—this "other belief" being Communism.

If the democratic world had understood that a transforming idea cannot be made to stand still, that it must either advance or retreat, take in new territory or yield to a more vigorous contender, there would have been no room for Communism. It cannot be too greatly emphasized that from the hour of emergence, democracy began to be *throughout the world* an invitation to new ways of life, a revolutionary influence, a provocation and incitement. What had been done in one place could be done in others. Democracy had introduced not merely hope, but expectation. When what was expected failed to arrive, a condition arose that was ripe for exploitation. The Communists understood this and have made the most of their advantage. Where democracy held back, Communism has plunged forward.

Nor is there any doubt that the Communist aim is universal. What the democratic countries failed to see, namely, that by the beginning of the twentieth century the world had been converted into a single, vast society united by the industrial revolution and the technological changes that were following it, the Communists perceived immediately and laid their plans accordingly. The world had to be organized—all of it—and the Communists proposed to do it by dictatorship. They called it the dictatorship of the proletariat. Yet, in the United States, even after two world wars, it is only dimly recognized that the internationalism of Communism will have to be matched and surpassed, item by item, by the internationalism of democracy. It is true that we have supported the United Nations and tried to make it more democratic in certain of its aims and purposes; it is also true that we have engaged in vast programs of relief and have created agencies of economic rehabilitation. If we had not done these things, by now our cause would have been lost.

But we need more than this. We need a democratic purpose as large, as fully spelled out, as realistic and as energetic as the Communist purpose. We must say, for instance, exactly what we mean by "freedom from want." It is not just a matter of giving away part of what we grow in America; it is a matter of increasing production in the critical areas upon the basis of plans as practical as those of the Communists but with the vital difference that "freedom from want" shall carry with it all the other freedoms. Wherever the standard of living rises, Communism retreats. Very few people want to be communized if they can be free and also have enough to eat. If we will allow ourselves to understand this, we can develop a weapon far more potent than the atom bomb and one which the Kremlin cannot

---

The Rev. A. Powell Davies is one of America's best-known preachers. Minister of All Souls' Church, Unitarian, in Washington, he is the author of "Faith of an Unrepentant Liberal."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duplicate. We can help people to be free from hunger *and free from tyranny as well!* This is the "incitement" needed to restore their faith in democracy and bring about a Communist defeat.

As for the other freedoms, it is obvious that only democracy supplies them. This is true, also, of freedom from the fear of war. There are those who suppose that Communist dominion, if it were unchallenged, would at least produce peace. Such a hope is quite delusive. The same causes that set Stalin against Trotsky and have now set him against Tito and which have been responsible for purges and political assassinations would continue to operate. It would be impossible for the Kremlin to keep as tight a grip on the entire world as it does on Russia and its present satellites, and thus there would be an age of ruthlessly competing factions, each with its own dictator, endlessly conspiring and, when it served their purpose, making war upon each other. No system composed as the Kremlin system is composed could bring the possibility of peace. Only democracy—international democracy, with an open system, not a closed one, and based upon discussion, not conspiracy, and freedom of information, not iron curtain—could achieve the structure of a genuine peace. It is therefore indispensable, not merely optional, that democracy shall become a universal purpose.

But there is still another reason for adopting this conclusion. Let us ask ourselves what the intention of the Kremlin is toward the United States. There is no possibility whatever of the United States becoming Communist. Indeed, if there were, the Kremlin would be alarmed. A Communist United States would be too powerful a rival and might take away supremacy from Russia. But, as I say, there is no possibility of it, and the Kremlin knows it. We have no multitude of landless peasants, famine-ridden and mutinous; we have no restless and rebellious proletariat. In short, whatever our deficiencies, they are not such as Communism can use to produce a revolution.

This places us in a very interesting situation. We cannot be made a part of the Soviet system, and yet, if we are outside of it, we threaten it by our very existence. As long as the United States continues to be productive and powerful, the Kremlin will be anxious and its victories insecure. If part of the Soviet empire revolts, the United States may assist it, just as we are thinking of doing in the case of Yugoslavia. We may invent some quite conclusive weapon and surprise the Kremlin with it. In any case, we remain a symbol of hope to the multitudes the Soviet has coerced into servitude.

Since, therefore, we cannot be drawn within the Soviet system and yet are unbearably dangerous by remaining outside it, there can be only one intention the Kremlin has for the United States: complete destruction. This must also be the case with any other democracy which cannot be communized or subjugated. Only with the powerful democracies destroyed can the rest of the world be organized for Communism. Therefore, as long as the Kremlin holds to its purpose of world dominion, these democracies, and especially the United States, are threatened with extinction. This may be contemplated by the Soviet Government with some reluctance, as in the case of the starving of the Ukrainian peasants in the 1930s or the present working to death of the millions in the slave camps. But the end would be held to justify the means. Anything whatever is counted appropriate if it serves the cause of Communist advancement. Plainly, therefore, the United States will never know peace again until the power of the Kremlin has been broken; nor, most probably, will any of the other democracies. But how is this to come about? The answer is that it can only come about when enough of this world, both East and West, is democratic.

Until this happens, the United States must be a nation in arms, moving from one urgency to another. And if it lasts too long, the question arises as to whether we can keep our own democracy. There is no alternative; for the United States and its democratic allies to survive, the democratic way of life must be extended. This does not mean that Western systems must be uniform or that the East must duplicate them. Democracy is an open system, not a closed one, and its patterns can be versatile. What is necessary is that democratic principles defeat dictatorship, not merely in debate or by resort to arms but through their application and embodiment. Until democracy is ascendant in the rest of the world, it cannot be made secure—nor anything else—within the present democracies.

It is extremely critical that we understand this situation and begin to act upon it. The US must know, as Lincoln did, that democracy has always been a purpose destined to be universal. He must save the Union, Lincoln said, not for itself alone but to keep alive "the principle it lives by, for man's vast future." What was then the future is now the present. The hour is late, and many opportunities have slipped away. And yet, there is still time if we are willing to delay no longer and begin to use it. We alone can carry hope to those whom the Communists have conquered. We alone can lead the way to wider freedom, equal justice and the promise of a lasting peace. Democracy has no alternative except a world condemned to ruin and destruction.

Let us then shape our plans to meet realities and make the democratic world the master of its destiny.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLAND'S CHICAGO "TRIBUNE"

by Richard L. Strout

THERE IS the making of a beautiful friendship between belligerent Col. Robert McCormick of the Chicago *Tribune* and saintly Kingsley Martin of the left-wing *New Statesman and Nation* of London. The *Tribune*, as everyone knows, is "the world's greatest newspaper," while the *NS&N* is, by audit, the largest weekly of opinion in the United Kingdom. Different as the publishers are in some respects, they share a furious self-rectitude, a fine ability to raise everybody's blood-pressure and a loathing for American foreign policy.

In fairness to the *NS&N* it should be hastily added that its virtues are manifest. It proceeds always from the loftiest motives. It has an honorable tradition of British radicalism which has fathered most of America's social legislation. It is ably written, stuffed with advertising and its rather mixed stable of writers include many of calibre and integrity. In Britain it goads the Labour Government to keep Left. For the world at large it champions the underdog. Since the USA is now international top dog, trouble brews for luckless Americans. The *New Statesman and Nation* may be wrong but never half-hearted.

Critics argue that there are underdogs also in Russia. The *NS&N* rarely mentions them. Some feel it is too busy chastising America. Others reluctantly conclude that there is a double standard in these things. In any event, in a Europe where neutralism is a major force and in a Britain where labor is deeply divided, the *NS&N* is worth most careful examination.

There are, of course, socialists also in America. Norman Thomas is one. In the current issue of *The Progressive*, he takes a position characteristic of most American liberals, a prayerful hope in the wisdom of the UN Korean intervention and a firm verdict against aggression, whether by North Koreans or Chinese. Of one thing he is positive: white imperialism in Asia must end.

It is breath-taking to contrast Professor G.D.H. Cole in the *NS&N* for February. His article, "As a Socialist Sees It," denounces white imperialism, but argues that is just what the USA is now practising in Korea. The Americans' real purpose, he holds, is to prevent the awakening of Asia.

The troubled American liberal finds himself in a strange world where all the symbols are the same but the end result is nightmare. He, too, like the *NS&N*, loathes McCarthyism, asserts American Negroes have had a bad deal, feels gooseflesh over General MacArthur's literary style. But after admitting these things and still reading the *NS&N*, he finds himself first angered, then nonplussed, then fascinated.

The point about the *NS&N* is that it views America as verging on a police state seeking world conquest and itself as the champion fighting to prevent it. This is mixed with a certain smugness, as when attractive, volatile R. H. S. Crossman reviewing the Hiss case observes that "our British patriotism is rooted in the soil and our loyalty is part of a traditional establishment" whereas, in unfortunate America, patriotism "is still very largely an acquired not an inherited characteristic; and loyalty is due not to a monarch who stands above party but to a man-made constitution." We may snigger a bit at this old-school-tie approach, and if the *NS&N* stopped there it would be all right.

There is also an ignorance of America which is sometimes breath-taking. I recall the unfortunate start of an editorial: "Those of us who know Algernon Hiss . . ." I imagine the acquaintanceship was slight, for the first name is Alger, not Algernon. At the intercession of a friend, I myself at one time had a brief connection with the *NS&N*, unfamiliar with its prejudices, and this circumstance possibly accounts for a continuing interest in editorial policy amounting now to absorption. Putting it pithily, the lead editorial for December 23 asks: "Can We Save America from Herself?" After reading the magazine avidly for some years I have reached the conclusion that this will not be easy.

There is something uncanny in the way *NS&N* dispatches from all over the world, no matter how they begin, converge ultimately on the faults of the US. For example, the American reader turns hopefully to a piece on the Argentine in the December 30 issue ("Where Meat is King"). Here, surely, there can be a meeting of minds over Peron, the little South American Mussolini. But no, it soon appears that Peron is not wholly bad after all; at least he refuses to be drawn inside "Washington's nylon curtain." Nothing is said about Peron's feud with La Prensa or similar tyrannies.

The editorial voice of the *New Statesman* is strong, righteous and dogmatic. It is not bothered by doubts. It wants a third force between the USA and the USSR. It seems disturbed that some Englishmen regard Russia as the greater menace. For its purpose Gen. Douglas MacArthur is a heaven-sent symbol. Few Americans

Richard L. Strout is a member of the Washington bureau of the "Christian Science Monitor."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realize the distrust that the "talking General" has engendered round the world. The cornerstone of the *NS&N* dogma in the Korean controversy is that MacArthur deliberately and flagrantly disobeyed UN directives.

I am not ordinarily a defender of MacArthur, but, searching high and low in Washington, I find no proof that he disobeyed the loose and uncertain UN orders. Truman, Acheson and leading British authorities specifically deny it. Yet the *NS&N* comes back frequently and categorically to the point. On November 18, the magazine's columnist "Critic" repeats:

"The facts we cited on our front page about his disobedience to UN directives (on November 11) were not speculative, but precise and incontrovertible." This flat assertion is never explained. I believe it is incorrect.

The original charge against MacArthur is coupled with a second that the Red Chinese were positively assured that UN troops would cross neither the 38th Parallel nor the so-called Isthmus Line. Here again no corroboration is offered. It runs counter to all information available in Washington.

If the *NS&N*, like the Chicago *Tribune*, is not above giving only one set of facts, or even perhaps of manufacturing a little evidence on the side, at least it does this only from the loftiest of motives. Furthermore it is not always harsh. Toward nations in its favor it can be kind, soft and even fond. Take China, for example. In a recent article, "Re-educating China," January 13, a rosy picture is painted by an anonymous author described as a "returned businessman." The transformation which he depicts in China is almost unbelievable. The administration of the universities is now shared by "faculty, students, charwomen and gardeners." He finds "no censorship" in bookstores. In the factories, self-criticism has greatly increased output. If workers prove shy or backward, "any reluctance to disclose intimate details of one's life is soon dissipated in the friendly, warm atmosphere of people engaged in a common effort." Cozy indeed! It recalls another Communist utopia, Czechoslovakia.

A fallacy of international comparisons is to interpret the general from the particular and to use poor judgment in picking the particular. Just before the Congressional election a special correspondent of the *NS&N* in New York sorrowfully reported that he was following in Manhattan the "last-ditch fight of what used to be the American Left." He added that that once-considerable body had now "dwindled down from the mass legions of the New Deal days" to a single figure. The solitary figure was Vito Marcantonio.

Colonel McCormick's distrust of England is only matched by Kingsley Martin's of America. Each sweeps the Atlantic with jaundiced glass. British readers of the *NS&N* cannot believe visitors' wild tales that trade unions still survive in America and that the nation is not a police state bent on war. The *NS&N* insists that Americans wish to rule the world and that its consecrated task is to circumvent the plot.

Reports of US isolationism leave the *NS&N* baffled and annoyed. Its image is of a nation bent on seizing Africa, Asia and the Canary Isles. How to fit Hoover into this scheme is terribly upsetting; it is hard to know whether he irritates the *NS&N* more because he is an isolationist or because he is not. The notion that the average American youth would prefer school to the Army, that the taxpayers might well elect Taft in simple revulsion to overseas commitments, are beyond the limited vision of Kingsley Martin and his friends. Fortunately, however, editorial flexibility is equal to the occasion. American is drubbed for ignoring Europe or for interfering in Europe, sometimes in the same issue.

There is a cult of American readers who follow the *NS&N* with the same stunned interest with which they follow the Chicago *Tribune*. Irritation has long since succumbed to reluctant admiration. The ingenuity with which the US is always put in the wrong is brilliant. Take a jolly little fictional piece about Korea, "The Human Kind," by one Alexander Baron, January 20. Two American officers show their coarse ruthlessness: "There ain't no people here [in Korea] . . . only gooks." The episode closes as one shoots a friendly native laughing at cantonment movies from a neighboring tree. "Ya'd think the guy was human!" he snarls in brutish wonder, pulling the trigger.

Doubts arise sometimes as to whether the *NS&N* is not merely following the party line. This hardly seems possible, yet the evidence is baffling. Correspondent Aylmar Vallance, for example, rhapsodizes in the November 4 issue over a Communist workers' procession in Genoa. Revolution in Italy is inevitable, he concludes, and it must necessarily be Communist-led. He speaks with characteristic positiveness.

Vallance's spiritual submission to the Red lodestar is duplicated by another distinguished *NS&N* correspondent, Basil Davidson. His conclusions in a series of articles also on Italy are that America and the Catholic Church represent the latest foreign invasion while the Communists and their allies are the inheritors of Garibaldi—the "new risorgimento."

So the *New Statesman* goes its lively and hugely successful way. It is crammed with book and classified advertising. Its reviews, with an introductory essay by V. S. Pritchett, are of high quality. There are entertaining competitions, and the magazine's poet, Sagittarius, has a nice touch. Letters to the editor frequently go a bit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beyond the editorials. For example, repeated applause appeared for the proposal of another letter-writer that in case of "Russia invading Western Europe and the US retaliating with atomic weapons our country [England] should withdraw from the conflict—and make the best of an unpleasant situation."

Those of us who have a particular place in our hearts for the Chicago *Tribune* will know how to value and appreciate the *NS&N*. The basic parallel is not perhaps in their dogmatism, fear of cousins overseas or neat way of handling uncomfortable facts. It lies deeper. Each is devastating in scoring the flaws and contradictions of poor stumbling democracies and the faltering UN, and each is lacking in what to practical men seem like reasonable alternatives. Here they are spiritual twins. The *Tribune* advocates isolationism. The *NS&N* advocates neutralism which is isolationism under another name. Both laugh at Eisenhower. Both ridicule the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Both fear German rearmament (and rightly). Both fall silent when asked how they would halt Soviet aggression. McCormick would center on the US. Kingsley Martin would do it all by mirrors. He proposed once a "nuisance" force to defend Europe—not bombers, just fighters, and the AAF would be withdrawn. The force seems rightly called since it would be too small to halt occupation but large enough to insure its brutality as the Russians took inevitable retaliation.

Almost unnoticed by the *NS&N* are the millions of Americans who take a sympathetic interest in the great experiment of the Labour Government. Only now and then does an inkling of a liberal America intrude. Recently "Critic" in his column quoted Gallup findings of US opinion on foreign policy and exclaimed that "the attitude of ordinary Americans . . . does not seem to be very different from that of Britain. . . ." The discovery seemed to amaze him.

Such gaps in the self-made clouds are, however, infrequent. This is fortunate, for otherwise it might overthrow the whole black and white world of Kingsley Martin. To him Americans are a special kind of "gooks." As he pulls the editorial trigger, he mutters the words of his own fiction writer—"Ya'd think the guy was human!"

LABOR MOBILIZES

by Harry Conn

A UNIFIED and militant labor movement is on the threshold of rebellion against the entire defense-mobilization program and possibly against the Truman Administration itself. The angry resignations of the three labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board over a new wage formula and subsequent events have spot-lighted a seething unrest that has been mounting in bitterness since last fall.

Labor demands more representation in the mobilization for defense. It believes that American workers are taking an unjustified beating from the wage-price freeze which leaves food, rent and profits relatively free to rise while paychecks are held down. Underlying these grievances is a widespread conviction among labor leaders that the business-industry personnel who control the mobilization program put the principles of freedom for high profits and peacetime business practices ahead of everything else. They have concluded that mobilization officials, headed by Director Charles E. Wilson, are not doing the necessary job for the defense of this country.

Figures are quoted: Congress voted $40 billion for defense production in 1950 and only a $20 billion output was achieved. Labor officials will tell you of the numerous consumer-goods industries, forced to curtail operation in preparation for defense production, that are now standing idle because of material and administrative bottlenecks. In rubber, auto, steel, textile, clothing and other industries, union requests to the National Production Authority to get these laid-off workers back into production are unacknowledged and apparently unheeded. Union officials charge that bottlenecks are not the only cause of this critical situation, that the basic consideration of business competition has made the mobilization program "haphazard, inequitable and half-hearted."

To meet all critical problems arising out of the emergency, labor has finally reached the desirable stage of having molded itself into one voice—the United Labor Policy Committee—which pledges itself "unreservedly to the service of our nation and to the support of the President in the present crisis." The ULPC, formed last December, represents some 15 million workers—just about every segment of the organized labor movement with the exception of John L. Lewis' Mine Workers. Its four co-chairmen are: William Green, the AFL president; Philip Murray, the CIO president; Al Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists; and George Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Harry Conn has worked in the political and education divisions of the CIO Textile Workers Union. He is now free-lancing in Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
--- ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ULPC conferences with President Truman and Mobilization Director Wilson have not been completely fruitless, but no one from labor would call them productive. Wilson has been a hard man to deal with. He has never been regarded as pro-labor. His speech accusing the railroad workers of sabotage during their recent "sick leave" left a sour taste in many a unionist's mouth. President Truman appointed Wilson to the key post because of his reputation for pounding tables with a firm fist and accomplishing his objectives. He has more power now than was concentrated in any official, except the President, during World War II. In fact, it is questionable whether one man has ever been delegated more power over the nation's economic life in history. The President is supporting him rigidly, and conferences with Truman have not even slightly moved him to overrule Wilson.

Meetings between the ULPC and Wilson have not been dull. Phil Murray was heard to remark, in his rich Scots brogue, after leaving a recent session: "When you talk to that mahn, you get a feeling of complete frustration."

The ULPC is making three basic demands:

(a) A top-level assistant to the mobilization director in a policy-determining capacity and labor representation on all operating levels of all agencies.

(b) A roll back of prices and, if not an outright thaw in the wage freeze, a liberal interpretation of present regulations.

(c) Manpower controls placed under the Secretary of Labor.

The first demand, on personnel, is particularly important in light of the vast number of business and industry men in top policy roles. Wilson heads the list, closely followed by his assistant Sidney Weinberg, an international businessman, and Economic Stabilizer Eric Johnston, former president of the US Chamber of Commerce and czar of the movie industry. Johnston is unquestionably a liberal in contrast to the third top Wilson assistant, Gen. Lucius Clay. Both Wilson and Johnston have labor advisers from the trade-union movement, but these labor officials question how often their advice is taken.

The recent appointment of George Harrison, president of the AFL Brotherhood of Railroad Clerks, as a special assistant to Johnston and the selection of the IAM President Hayes as manpower aide to Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg are far from being top-level positions. Their policy-determining powers have yet to be defined. Certainly, these posts cannot compare with the position held by the CIO's Sidney Hillman during World War II.

Approximately six weeks ago the ULPC asked for a deputy to Wilson from their ranks. The request appeared to have been ignored until the labor members of the wage board resigned. Wilson then hurriedly offered to meet this request. The actual appointment is being withheld pending a clarification of labor's relationship to the entire program. Harrison, Hayes and the UAW-CIO head Walter Reuther are considered by the ULPC to be acceptable for the post.

One of the assumptions that roundly irks labor representatives is that when a business or industry man enters the Government he is automatically considered a public servant. When a labor man goes into a similar position, however, he is regarded not as a public servant but as just a labor representative in the Government. Trade unionists maintain that it is at least debatable whether a labor man in the Government looks out for the workers more than an industry man looks out for business.

Future events will determine whether resignations of the labor representatives from the WSB will be revoked or whether President Truman will accept them. Union officials desire a board makeup in which decisions resulting in a board deadlock would be finally decided by Johnston and Wilson. There are no labor men in the Price Stabilization Agency. There are none, to date, at the working level in the National Production Authority; two representatives of the CIO and the AFL have been kept in the lowly position of consultants for the last four months while the NPA bottlenecks have been increasing.

There are a number of explanations for this situation, in addition to the basic labor fight with the mobilization organization. The NPA, for example, is organized along industry lines. Manly Fleischmann, the NPA head, is planning to establish labor sections in each group. However, no responsible union official could afford to accept a position with these labor sections unless he had the backing of his particular union. And, if contracts are being reopened in an industry, it is difficult for the union to give it backing until there is a clear interpretation of mobilization orders and wage regulations.

Another explanation of why labor is excluded from the program might be seen in a letter from a top NPA official to the Washington representative of a large international union: "Our own experience and that of the former War Production Board indicate that it is generally desirable to confine industry advisory-committee membership to persons who are directly engaged in a business or industrial enterprise in an executive or technical capacity."

There are unquestionably some in the trade-union movement who seek Government representation merely for prestige for themselves or for the movement. But this is a definite minority. Most labor officials have a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solid grasp of the world crisis and realize that the defense-mobilization effort is basically a morale problem and that an excluded — or partially excluded — labor movement is not conducive to rank-and-file morale. Nor does an unjust paycheck beating stimulate production.

As to their second demand, on the wage-price freeze, labor leaders maintain they received definite White House assurances that there would be a price rollback, and they bitterly conclude that Wilson overruled this commitment. The Defense Production Act of 1950 does not actually freeze prices, and labor knows of no planned action by mobilization officials to counter the consequent rises that are sure to occur.

The wage formula which precipitated the WSB flare-up would permit 10 percent increases in wages and salaries from a January 15, 1950, base date. "Fringe" benefits, like pensions and health insurance, previously put into effect would not be included in the 10 percent, but any such benefits granted from now on must be counted as raises in pay.

The ULPC, upon withdrawing its labor members from the WSB, stated that the formula was "unworkable and unfair" and an "ill-considered action." The CIO Textile Workers' president and former Wage Stabilization Board member Emil Rieve spoke for all labor when he testified before the Joint House-Senate Committee on the Economic Report that:

> Controls over wages alone, without any overall stabilization policy, could only deepen the cut into the workers' living standards. . . . Stabilization cannot be achieved by controlling only one group of the population. . . . Let us not be tempted to put iron-clad controls on wages because of the relative ease with which it can be done.

Faced with the bare fact that this is the tendency, a substantial number of union officials are now urging their members to go after increases from their employers, even if it means striking, and to carry the battle to the Wage Stabilization Board if and when the fight is won. The strike of 70,000 CIO woolen workers is the first such action. Unrest can be anticipated in many more industries unless the wage freeze is modified.

The third demand of the ULPC is that manpower be placed under the office of the Secretary of Labor.

Seemingly, with Wilson's appointment of Arthur Flemming as top manpower boss, with authority over manpower controls and the allocation of men between civilian industry and the armed forces, labor has already lost this point.

This is the only issue on which Truman has failed to go right down the line with Wilson. The President had Wilson delay the Flemming appointment for two weeks while he asked Secretary Tobin to submit a manpower program drawn up by the Department of Labor. The Department apparently does not have the organization for such a program at the present time. Tobin could not achieve agreement even among his three assistant secretaries. So Wilson won his manpower demand. In reply to those who maintain that labor wanted Tobin to head the manpower program because the union leaders could control him, one top CIO leader said: "We don't want a man we can control; we want a man we can talk to. The only people who can talk to Wilson are those from industry. We certainly can't."

One of the real fears behind labor's stand in the manpower fight is the feeling that, with Flemming as chief, the real power will rest with General Clay. Opinions on Flemming, held by various top labor people, vary from "okeh" to "unrealistic and technical." All agree, though, that he is easy-going and a compromiser. Clay, as manpower-boss-in-fact, is frightening for labor to contemplate. He still thinks and acts as a military man. More than once Mrs. Rosenberg has had to pound home the fact that he cannot give orders to workers as he would to an army. Some unionists think that Wilson and Clay are convinced that national service legislation will be essential in time and are slowly preparing for it. Too much labor participation on the policy-determining level would not fit into these plans.

The experience of World War II offers substantial evidence that a fully co-operating labor movement, given adequate voice and adequate consideration, is almost essential to the success of a mobilization effort. Labor has thus far been assigned a far from desirable role in the present crisis. The President they worked so hard to elect in 1948 has delegated unprecedented powers to men who, labor feels, are placing the mobilization program at the mercy of the business world. Trade unionists remain outside, looking in.

Whether the present disgruntlement materializes into outright non-co-operation depends on: how the mobilization officials meet the demands of the ULPC; the pressure from the union membership; and the state of the world crisis. Obviously no cure-all solution is possible. Labor expects to compromise. It is willing to accept wage control if assured of price parity. Partial acceptance of labor's demands will probably result in corresponding co-operation. However, if labor officials remain convinced that this country's productive potential is not being adequately mobilized for defense and that unnecessary burdens are being placed on the lower income groups, many may decide that non-co-operation is the only weapon for achieving the fundamental changes they consider essential, not only for the security of this country, but for the ultimate defense of the entire free world.

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *Sherman's Hell; Korea's Hell*

GENE SYMONDS, a United Press staff correspondent, filed the following dispatch on January 16 which it seems to me has not been given the widespread publicity that it ought to have:

On the Western Front, Korea

She was feeding her baby when death struck from the sky.

The handsome, young, Korean woman lay sprawled beside the road into Osan. One breast was bared to the winter wind, and her arms were frozen in the position she last had held her baby. Next to her in a snow bank was the baby, swaddled in rags, its frozen face peering out.

The mother and child were only two of the many refugees killed along the road leading into battered Osan which American forces captured Monday. Bodies of refugees had been dragged to the side of the road. . . . Some spots where the snow and frozen blood had melted were turning brown.

Blankets and children's clothes, bits of clothing and small tots' articles were strewn along the road in confusion. At one place I saw a tiny, red, baby cap with something in it in the mud. I didn't see the baby.

Some of the refugees were frozen to death; others were ripped to pieces. One man, or woman—I couldn't tell which—dressed in tattered clothes, looked like a cotton-stuffed rag doll that had been chewed by a playful puppy.

This stretch of road was strafed several days ago on a report by air observers that Chinese Communist soldiers were shedding their uniforms and mingling with columns of refugees.

I didn't see any dead soldiers yesterday. That of course does not mean they were not there. . . . I don't know. This is just one spot on one road in Korea. There are many more that I haven't seen.

This particular group had been reported at 5,000 men. There were a few dozen dead.

There are very few refugees moving south in this area now. . . .

When Gen. William T. Sherman said that war was "hell," he was conservative. While I do not know what his conception of hell was, I imagine that it was the conventional hell of the Calvinist—eternal fires consuming brimstone and everything else that they could reach. Sherman's march through Georgia to the sea during the Civil War left still-livid scars on the consciousness of the people who worked the farms and lived in the towns over and through which Sherman forged his way.

I wonder how long it will take for the South Koreans, Orientals though they be, and therefore presumptively more indifferent to maiming and death than we Westerners, to forget the suffering and pitiless death that is so vividly portrayed in this dispatch. Sherman's army in its day was also pitiless. Living upon the country as it did, little consideration could be shown. But, after all, Sherman was fighting those who were trying to dismember his country. The Koreans who, according to this UP message, were strafed from the air were presumably South Koreans to whom the United Nations is supposed to be restoring liberty. They had welcomed us to South Korea with shouts of joy. We were deliverers, bringing aid and comfort and unity.

Apparently we were bringing other things—wounds and dismemberment and death. Bombs falling from the air, or bullets from machine-guns being fired into a hurrying or huddled mass, cannot distinguish between the sexes or between the aged and infants. Throughout this dramatic dispatch Mr. Symonds uses such expressions as: "The many refugees killed," "Bodies of refugees had been dragged to the side of the road." "Some of the refugees were frozen to death"—*Refugees! Refugees! Refugees!* He says: "I did not see any dead soldiers yesterday." "They might have been some of the men I saw who had been shot." "I don't know." And then this poignant note: "Perhaps a few Chinese or Korean Communists were killed. I hope it was worth it."

I suspect that if General Sherman had seen what Gene Symonds saw in Korea, to which the UN has sent soldiers, ships and airplanes in order that they might restore and assure the promised liberty that includes, foremost of all, immunity from physical molestation and the warding off of sudden death, he would have concluded that the word, "hell," was too mild to describe modern warfare, however fitting it may have been in his own day.

Gene Symonds wrote with simple eloquence: "This is just one spot on one road in Korea. There are many more I have not seen. As I drove into Osan I swerved my jeep to and fro through the pools of blood."

If this report by an eye witness was censored, it should not have been. The people of the United Nations have a right to know the truth. And, since their voices will be potent in determining whether we shall aggressively crusade for peace or allow the MacArthurs and the Knowlands to push us into another and more frightful war, it is the duty of the Government and of the newspapers to see that we know the truth.

Drew Pearson's column for February 26 quoted a US captain as writing, "I wish the people of the US could see the horror of war. . . . Hundreds . . . are dying daily from lack of food and the intense cold. . . ." HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UMI BELL
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF A SUCCESSFUL PROTEST MOVEMENT

by Ronald Thompson

IN THIS BOOK Dr. Moore, an associate of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University, has made a basic contribution not only to the study of Soviet politics in particular but also to the understanding of the "dilemma of power" in general. Combining the techniques of a professional sociologist with those of a specialist in the Russian field, he has endeavored to come to terms with some of the fundamental problems of our time. "Stated in their simplest form," he says, "the central questions asked in this book are two: Which of the pre-revolutionary Bolshevik ideas have been put into effect in the Soviet Union, which ones set aside, and why? Secondly, what can we learn from this historical experience about the role of ideas in general?"

SOVIET POLITICS: THE DILEMMA OF POWER, by Barrington Moore Jr. (Harvard; $6).

One way of summarizing the wealth of data which has been amassed in answering these questions is to plot out what the author calls "the natural history of a successful protest movement," taking the Bolshevik experience as the basis for constructing a general pattern for the process (or "ideal-type," *à la* Max Weber). On this basis we learn that a protest movement, such as the Marxist, characteristically begins with a simple acceptance of the formal ideology to which it adheres. But "as the organization develops, and as leaders emerge, a process of differentiation takes place. If the group is to win power and influence, if it is going to accomplish anything, it must take power factors into account. The dilemma between means and ends raises its head." And corresponding to this dilemma, a division occurs in the arsenal of ideas by which the movement is motivated.

Basically this division reflects a growing cleavage between the leadership and the rank and file, with the former being more and more won to the problem of means despite continued use of the language of ends in addressing its following.

The possibilities of contradiction between these two aspects of the program soon prove enormous. In particular, the author points out, the idea that inequalities of power are a necessary part of human society—*i.e.*, that some must command and others obey—received very little recognition in the pre-revolutionary Bolshevik ideology of *ends* but extraordinary recognition in what he calls the Bolshevik ideology of *means*. For the ideology of means was directed toward the development of a tight conspiratorial party of the revolutionary elite at the very moment that the ideology of ends was dealing with the glittering generalities of participation by the masses and the withering away of the state.

Then, with the assumption of power in 1917, the authoritarian elements in the movement rapidly submerged the anti-authoritarian elements. Indeed, the early mass democratic ideas and practices are seen by Moore to have undergone a "sea change," with the result that they now serve as justifications and official apologia for a completely anti-democratic regime. The safeguards of "democratic centralism" and "self-criticism," for example, have been modified in such a way that they no longer "act as a check upon the power of the top Party leaders. Instead they serve as devices to strengthen this power by directing the hostility of the masses against local nodules of power in the lower levels of the bureaucratic system." Criticism is deflected away from policy (*i.e.*, from the top command) to the execution of policy (*i.e.*, to the lower command) and serves to reinforce discipline rather than to restrain it. Roberto Michels' "iron law of oligarchy" is confirmed and informed with new meaning.

The final result is that means and ends have been reversed. The libertarian ends now serve the authoritarian means rather than vice versa. The contradiction between the ways chosen by the leadership to effect its program and the ultimate goals of that program itself has been resolved by the leaders' manipulation of the formal ideology of ends to serve as a cover for their own more genuine purposes. Thus what began as a "protest movement" seeking anti-authoritarian aims has been transformed by success into an authoritarian regime chiefly concerned with maintaining and developing its power. The "natural history" of Bolshevism has come full circle.

As for the two questions with which Moore begins his study, the specific answer to the first seems to be that "the transfer of the means of production to the society as a whole is the only aspect of Marxist-Leninist doctrine about which one can say with considerable plausibility that the goal has been achieved." Among the many instances of non-fulfillment, the striking reversal of early Bolshevik notions of social equality seems to Moore to warrant generalization. "The Bolshevik experience, it is suggested, reveals the need for inequalities of power in an industrial society. . . . If this conclusion is correct, one may infer legitimately enough that widespread demands for social equality are in a broad sense utopian. In this respect conservative pleas against moving in this direction may be regarded as being based on social necessities."

In answering his second question regarding the role of ideas in general, Moore makes an important distinction already suggested by his remarks on the ideology of ends and ideology of means. Thus one must note, he says, the formal or *official* ideology of the masses, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consists of publicly stated programs phrased in the symbols of the original doctrine. But beyond this one should distinguish the informal or *operating* ideology of the leaders as representing a transition from ends to means, or from original doctrines to power considerations. The role of the former—the Marxist-Leninist tradition—"appears to have been to provide the major questions to be asked about the political environment, as well as a few of the answers." The role of the latter—"the actual beliefs of the ruling elite"—supplies through all the day-to-day decisions of the Politburo "an unsuspected and consistent pattern of apparent motivation and goals," thereby indicating that the policy makers do carry out their plans on the basis of a definite, if unstated and unofficial, series of ideological assumptions.

By definition, therefore, the problem of the role of ideas in social change would seem to narrow down largely to a consideration of the operating as distinct from the official ideology involved. Strangely enough, however, Moore does not do this. Without himself being a Marxist, he remains in a curious fashion the prisoner of the very official ideology which he is placing under examination, since in his close reliance upon Soviet sources as the principal basis for his investigation he is necessarily confined to subjects which are covered by such sources. Thus he deals with the use of terror as an instrument of policy in the early years of the Civil War, this being a time when the published debates contain extensive references to the problem. But when discussion of this point was shut off beginning in 1921, Moore's own commentary comes to an end and he contents himself with the bald remark that in the Stalin era "the scope of terrorism had reportedly expanded greatly." The ubiquitous police, the forced-labor system, the liquidation of the kulaks, and other matters, are similarly slighted and for the same apparent reason.

Moreover, one might wonder at the altered relation between means and ends which Moore implies came about after the year 1917. If the normal relationship could be reversed and the ends be made to serve the means after the seizure of power, why could not the same thing have occurred before its seizure? Moore tends to prejudge the issue by dealing with Lenin's aims respecting the non-authoritarian state in Chapter III and then taking up Lenin's "contradictory" methods via the conspiratorial party in Chapter IV. But actually the principal source for the non-authoritarian aims is the *State and Revolution*, written in 1917, while the classic treatment of the authoritarian methods is the *What Is to Be Done* of 1902. Why could not the authoritarianism of 1902 represent the *real* objective of the Bolshevik movement (the end rather than the means), and the anti-authoritarianism of 1917 be merely the appropriate method for promoting these objectives in a revolutionary situation?

This is a matter of no small importance, for if true it could rule out as irrelevant a major portion of Moore's carefully constructed "natural history of a successful protest movement." Pre-revolutionary Bolshevism, in this view, would not be primarily a reform-seeking, or "protest," movement but a power-seeking movement for which the authoritarian structuring of society would have been from the very beginning the actual operating ideology of the leaders. Nationalization of the means of production would in that case not be the only aspect of the Bolshevik goal to have been fulfilled, but on the contrary the *real* goals of Bolshevism would have to be reckoned as being fulfilled a hundred and a thousand fold. The role of ideas in social change might likewise be differently assessed if, instead of contrasting Lenin's ends with Stalin's means, the operating ideology of each were made the consistent basis of comparison.

When all is said and done, however, the starting point for any further investigation of the problem will for a long time to come undoubtedly be Moore's own monumental study. If it sometimes falls short of the magnitude of the task attempted, it is easily first in the field in terms of comparable studies elsewhere available. Clyde Kluckhohn's remark in the preface that "Here basic social science has been achieved" is well taken. In its broad vision and command of the subject, in its careful methodology and painstaking research, Moore's study is quite probably the most impressive contribution to Sovietology yet made.

Ronald Thompson, assistant professor of Russian, Far Eastern and European History at George Washington University, is co-author, with Samuel N. Harper, of "The Government of the Soviet Union." He is currently at work on a sociological study of Lenin.

THIS IS THE ARMY

FROM HERE TO ETERNITY, by James Jones (Scribner's; $4.50).

THE PREPONDERANCE of books about the Army and war have dealt almost exclusively with the draftee, the short-term citizen-soldier, who was in for the duration plus six months. The "regular" soldier, the "thirty-year man," usually appeared in the guise of a tough drill sergeant or a major with temporary rank. Those of us who were in the service for the shooting phase regarded the "regular" man as inhuman, an automaton, devoid of all feeling and emotion. If we did not learn our mistake at the time, James Jones makes it amply clear to us in his provocative first novel, *From Here to Eternity*.

The locale is Hawaii, Schofield Barracks, where the "Pineapple Army" carries on its humdrum professional soldiering: drilling, brawling, whoring, drinking, while in the background is the palpable presence of Pearl Harbor. It is a perfect setting, managed with the skill of a first-rate dramatist. The Japanese sneak attack, of which only the reader is aware, will not hit for another six months.

If we are to take the author's word for it, and there is no reason why we shouldn't, the professional army was in large part no different from any other segment of society, with the exception of a rigid discipline imposed from above. It was a world of ambition, jealousy, politicking, brutality. Here were the "misfits" who had run away from civilian life; the patient ones, the fawning ones, the small men with small hori-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

zons. Jones knows them all to the last fiber. His descriptions of life on the post, in the barracks; the humor, the pathos, are of an exceptionally high order. He does equally well with the world outside, Honolulu and its bars and brothels, pimps, prostitutes, queers —all those who live off the Army. The sweep and sensitivity of his observations often bring Thomas Wolfe to mind. His people, especially the soldiers, are splendidly drawn.

Jones's canvas is, however, much larger than the Army. He ventures into love affairs with native and Eurasian girls and American prostitutes, into plots and counter-plots, incredible escapades, all tending to take us far afield from the subject the author knows best. Through it all runs his premise that we are damned from here to eternity. Whether or not his premise is sound, it dictates the selection of characters; we find ourselves in the presence of small, caught, tortured, confused people whose passions fizzle out like damp firecrackers, while the book itself is on a scale that begs for great passions and great deeds.

Perhaps the novel's outstanding weakness is its protagonist, Robert E. Lee Prewitt, a private attached to the infantry. Prewitt ran away from Harlan, Kentucky, because he did not want to follow his father and grandfather into the coal mines. He enlisted in 1936 when he was just seventeen. In the Army he discovered that he was an excellent bugler and a very good welterweight. Once while sparring he blinded a man, and as a result decided to give up fighting. He loved bugling, but gave that up too after having been deprived by the sergeant of his status as First Bugler in the company. Bugling was ". . . the only way he had ever found, the only code, the only language, by which he could speak and be heard by other men, could communicate himself. . . ."

Prewitt is a non-conformist, proud, stubborn, willing to give the Army its due, yet determined to retain his own rights and dignity. Inevitably, his personal code clashes with its surroundings. He is abused, tortured by all sorts of devilish punishments, his spirit as well as his body taxed to the utmost. But being a "good soldier" he survives. We are told that he "loves" the Army, but we are shown only that he endures it. On a thousand occasions Prewitt's lively intelligence is called upon to question, weigh and doubt, but his "love" remains unquestioning and inviolate. It is an incredible act of love that carries no reward.

The author provides his character with a staggering range of experiences, eliciting reactions that prove his premise but leaving the reader unconvinced. Many of the sequences lack motivation and one has a feeling that Jones was determined to leave nothing unsaid. The result is that Prewitt is often no more than a mirror, a reacting agent who startles us with considered opinions on life, free will, morals, homosexuality, evil, politics, while on other occasions he is the tight, inarticulate man who wants only to blow his bugle and reenlist for another hitch when the time comes.

The other characters come alive with the exception of Corporal Isaac Nathan Bloom, who is drawn as an incredible jerk with a chip on his shoulder. We assume it was the author's intention to show to what desperate lengths a persecution complex will drive a man. But what emerges in Bloom is a caricature of a man, a snarling, obnoxious "punchie" who cannot redeem himself even in suicide. Those who are fond of their prejudices will be able to point to the "long-nosed" Bronx Jew, Bloom, as justification for their dislike. Toward the end, the author introduces a "normal" Jewish lieutenant, but it is too late to erase the unfortunate impression made by Bloom.

Despite the shortcomings, *From Here to Eternity* is an impressive achievement. Jones possesses exceptional skill, though his philosophy of life often gets in the way of his writing. There is more to living than frustration, dark alleys and defeat. Men also have dreams.

LOUIS FALSTEIN

Louis Falstein completed 50 missions with the 15th Air Force in World War II. He is the author of "Face of a Hero," published last year by Harcourt, Brace, and is working on a second novel.

BRIEF COMMENT

The Human Use of Human Beings, by Norbert Wiener (Houghton Mifflin; $3).

In his noted book on cybernetics Wiener dealt with the science of feed-back machines whose electrical-control systems simulate human behavior by directing the machines' conduct in response to "messages" or stimuli from outside. Since the development of this science must result in the mechanization of fields of activity hitherto regarded as exclusively human, the author attempts in the study to explain the potentialities of self-regulating, self-steering devices (cybernetics is derived from the Greek word for "steersman"), examines their beneficent possibilities and warns of the danger of their misuse in the selfish exploitation of human beings. A brilliant, tough-minded and courageously outspoken book whose only defect—not too serious—is its somewhat bewildering and rambling display of erudition: from discussion of entropy, the patent system, and philology through Duncan Phyfe, contemporary music, and Parkinson's disease. J. R. N.

History of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, by Edwin Emery (Minnesota; $3.50).

The American Newspaper Publishers Association was established in 1887 primarily to further the business interests of the press. Edwin Emery's narrative is a careful sketch of its main concerns since that time, ranging from advertising solicitation and labor relations to newsprint and freedom of the press. If the book is disappointing, it is not because the author failed to dig deeply into the Association's annals; he has done that admirably. We are left dissatisfied, rather, on a crucial question which he hardly touches.

Emery fails to give more than cursory examination to the relation between the ANPA business policies and the content of the press. Now it may be, as he holds, that the ANPA has no formal power over its members' policies. But the disapproval of one's business associates is unpleasant and exercises a force of its own. And with all the professional ethics imaginable, one wonders whether the publisher's concerns at Association meetings can be entirely isolated from his thinking on editorial and news policy. In any event, the possibility that an association of newspapers has at least potentially an unfair advantage in pursuing its "business objectives," and that this may have important social implications, merits more attention than it is given. HARVEY LEVIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON THE AIR

The Critics

NEW YORK CITY'S station, WNYC, is really a remarkable organization; if there were a dozen others like it across the country, radio and television would be light years above their present intellectual levels.

Consider WNYC's 12th annual Festival of American music, held as usual from Lincoln's Birthday to Washington's Birthday. For hours each day, the music of our country was played, sung, twanged, in ensembles large and small, and solo. This year, WNYC introduced 40 new pieces of music, some by unknowns and others by established composers. There were new operas by Martin Kalmanoff and Mario Balsamo; Norman Dello Joio contributed a new work, as did Henry Cowell and Daniel Gregory Mason. At the same time, there was plenty of Gershwin and Foster. In all, there were 112 special programs. For enterprise in the broadcasting field, and for responsibility to its community, WNYC is unmatched on the air today, but you too can have a WNYC—if you want one and try hard enough.

In substance, that's what one of the newest recruits to the thin ranks of radio-television criticism tells you in *Television and Our Children* (Longmans, Green; $1.50). Robert Lewis Shayon, the author of this timely brochure, is justly famous in radio. He is one of the two or three most imaginative, most creative radio directors in the country. But now Shayon is a critic. He got into this end of the business after being squeezed out of CBS, where his last important assignment—and he handled it with both artistry and showmanship—was the historical documentary series, "You Are There."

Shayon's views are that television is not showing sufficient responsibility toward our children, that parents and educators are not doing enough to make the medium toe the mark, that there should be more organized groups acting on behalf of the audience, that TV channels should be reserved for educators. It is all orthodox doctrine in my critical congregation—and I say Amen! But quite possibly there are several hundred thousand people able to read without moving their lips who have never heard of these ideas—and I hope they all get hold of Shayon's contribution.

As a critic while you run, reviewing the stuff that's on the air currently, Shayon is excellent. He and Goodman Ace—of the famous "Easy Aces," now top writer for NBC's very amusing Sunday-night, 90-minute marathon of radio fun, "The Big Show"—conduct, jointly, the column of radio-TV critical comment in the *Saturday Review of Literature*.

There is another new man in our ranks The New York *Post* has just started a radio-TV column by Rex Lardner, who will do his stint four days a week. The *Post* has had two influential radio columns in the past—one, some years ago, by Leonard Carlton, who was among the pioneers in the trade; another, more recently, by Paul Denis. Now the *Post* management has seen fit to pay attention to broadcasting again. Lardner hasn't had a chance yet to show his stuff, but if he's half as good as his *Post* predecessors, he'll have little difficulty in getting himself syndicated. Which will be all to the good. As a preliminary to intelligent audience participation in the *business* of broadcasting, we need more organized listener-viewer groups, on the local and regional levels as well as nationally. And a body of informed criticism, in more newspapers and magazines, by more Shayons, Aces and Lardners, will provide the leverage for such organizations.

As I write, it is not certain whether Lardner—who seems to be in the middle—will last on the *Post*. When that newspaper reduced its staff by 60 or 70 members more than two years ago, Denis was in the batch. The Newspaper Guild contends that the *Post's* management had undertaken to rehire the men fired if their jobs should be filled within three years. The Guild wants Denis reinstated—he had just quit his *Daily Compass* job, where he did a Broadway column. All I want, in addition to justice for everyone concerned, is more criticism.

SAUL CARSON

Hear . . .

The Mayor of West Berlin...ERNST REUTER

Hero of the Russian blockade • Survivor of Nazi concentration camps • No. 1 German on the Communist blacklist

Speak on . . .

"CAN DEMOCRACY SURVIVE IN EUROPE?"

Also: **Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, U. S. Prosecutor of Nuremberg Trials**
Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary

HUNTER COLLEGE AUDITORIUM
69th Street between Park & Lexington

Monday, March 5th, 8:30 P.M.

Tickets: $1 (including tax) at the door 75 cents (including tax) in advance from

Americans for Democratic Action
New York Chapter
Nine East Forty-sixth Street
New York 17, N. Y.

THEATRE

Fragments

A GRAPH of Ibsen's thematic material would show him oscillating between the determined idealism of "no compromise" and the more modern question of how much to compromise. In "Brand," the hero's refusal to compromise ends in a grimly heroic destructiveness which Ibsen regards with a mixture of tragic awe and slight misgiving. Nora's slamming of the door on compromise in "A Doll's House" made her the admired "new woman" of the nineteenth century, while Hedda Gabler's inability either to accept or reject compromise leads her to suicide. Stockmann in "An Enemy of the People" states the case for the lone rebel against compromise; the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

uncompromising idealist in "The Wild Duck" wreaks havoc with people on whom the cold truth acts as a fatal agent. In an age of pride in assertive individualism, Ibsen expressed doubt about the nature and limits of the individual, asked himself, in fact, in what way the individual might become a true *person*.

With "Peer Gynt" the Ibsen dialectic becomes the subject of an epic phantasmagoria. Peer wants "to be himself" and finds that to do so, that is, to become an unfettered individual, he is forced constantly to compromise and generally to "go around" at the behest of a nameless ogre who stands in the way of his going straight toward the desired goal. Those who have been entirely themselves are patients in a lunatic asylum; and Peer himself, who has unwittingly compromised all along, is forever being hoodwinked, making fortunes through skulduggery and self-humiliation, only to lose his gains with comic suddenness. In the end, Peer is bankrupt and baffled, unwilling to die because he has understood so little about his life that he has a sense of not having lived at all. "Peer Gynt" is one of the first of modern fables about the failure of the great tycoon who rises from rags to riches.

Ibsen's style in this play is an amalgam of poetry, satire, vaudeville, symbolism and "surrealism." To produce "Peer" so that it is clear—and too much literal or prosaic clarity would be to cheapen and devitalize it—is a formidable task requiring a combination of favorable circumstances and technical prowess that is almost unattainable in the American theatre today.

The ANTA production (under Lee Strasberg's direction) has arresting parts (the troll scene and the one in the mental hospital) but little discernible unity—except in its avoidance of theatrical romanticism, its effort to be down to earth. The total impression is ultimately inconclusive, so that we could not even arrive at any estimate of Paul Green's adaptation. There were a number of good acting bits (by Nehemia Persoff and Joseph Anthony), the ever prevalent excitement of Sono Osato's personality, a certain naive sensuality in the dancing, and creditable moments throughout which nevertheless failed to make anything but a fragmentary effect. John Garfield, one of the few actors who has had a successful Hollywood career and still loves acting for its own sake, thus showing a devotion to the most serious aspects of the theatre that is endearing, not to say noble, is only partly equipped for title role. His opening scenes have a certain vigorous charm, but the later Peer, who becomes a great figure in the world arena and then a broken old man, is at the moment definitely beyond him.

"The Green Bay Tree" (already closed) was a revival of Mordaunt Shairp's fashionable melodrama, which because of its slick craftsmanship and expert production was taken quite seriously in 1933. I was never able to believe in the play—no matter how well acted—which if it is a study in homosexuality is superficial and rather insincere, and if a depiction of the corrupting effects of the soft life, somewhat pointless because its characters are at best only acting vehicles rather than people. Joseph Schildkraut's performance in the recent revival proved him once again an actor who works with fanatic care, but one wished that he would find a play and a part worthier of his zeal.

The French-Canadian "Ti-Coq," by an actor calling himself Fridolin, died an untimely death. This is a pity, because the production contained some of the best character acting (Fred Barry, Denise Pelletier, Juliette Beliveau) seen hereabouts in a long time. Not only that, but much of the staging was of a superior quality, the ensemble remarkable for its warmth, and some of the writing witty, understanding and most engagingly human.

"Angel in the Pawnshop" is a sugary charade on practically nothing which attempts to bemuse by childishly glamorous light effects: off-stage music, on-stage clarinet playing, old jokes and Joan McCracken's appeal—the whole resembling a cluttered drawer of sentimental theatrical junk.

HAROLD CLURMAN

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

SCHOOL

MANUMIT SCHOOL

• Boys and girls 6-18 develop individuality in free creative atmosphere. Intercultural. College preparatory. Dramatics, art, music, sciences, mathematics. 80-acre farm in Bucks County between New York and Philadelphia. Friendly, informal, homelike. Healthful outdoor life. Horses. Summer camp. Catalog:
W. M. and B. G. C. FINCKE, Co-Directors,
Box R, R. F. D. #2, Bristol, Pennsylvania

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

CONTOUR SERIES: editions of original movie librettos. First issue, "The Old Easterday House." Romance linking old Chicago with the new. Send one dollar to Hill Press, 1108 Madison, Maywood, Ill.

FOREIGN BOOKS

FOREIGN BOOKS obtained promptly and at reasonable cost from our agents in 12 countries. Write for our catalog. Whyte Bookshop, 1518 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D. C.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis, Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors, psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee $5.00.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 8603, Rockefeller Plaza, New York.

ALL LANGUAGES BY RECORDS. ALL MAKES. Sold, bought; rented inexpensively. Alin, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, Mu 3-1093.

PUBLIC RELATIONS COUNSEL

Public Relations in the Nation's Capital; a full range of services including counsel, surveys and research, promotion and publicity. Charles Alldredge, Kellogg Bldg., Washington 4, D. C.

TYPING

MANUSCRIPT typing, theses, medical articles, specifications. Speed, intelligence, economy. Ambassador Office Service, 17 East 48th Street, New York. Plaza 5-1127.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE JOB AHEAD

Time-tested Red Cross services, backed by the generosity of the American people, have helped the victims of disaster . . . brought comfort to servicemen in camps and hospitals and to their families . . . assisted veterans . . . protected the health of the nation.

Again, the Red Cross mobilizes for mercy!
With your help, the nation's call for Red Cross assistance on a scale unprecedented in peacetime will be answered promptly and effectively. Here are some of the enormous tasks that have been accepted by your Red Cross:

Providing for instant use, tremendous amounts of blood plasma;
Training some 20-million persons in first aid;
Instructing 100,000 women and girls to serve as nurse's aides;
Recalling and retraining 150,000 former nurse's aides;
Teaching many more thousands home nursing skills;
Recruiting more than half a million additional volunteers to aid local defense units and to serve in expanding military installations.

MARCH IS RED CROSS MONTH

Only Your Support Can Make These Vital Activities Possible

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED